Reply to Office Action of April 26, 2006

Remarks

In the Office Action dated April 26, 2006, the Examiner rejected

claims 1-4 and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by the article by Kato, et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 8 and 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable

over Kato, et al. and further in view of the article by Smith, et al. The Examiner rejected

claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the U.S. Patent in the name

of Belissent 6,789,203.

By this Amendment, Applicants' Attorney has amended each of the independent

claims to more particularly point out and distinctly claim what Applicants regard as their

invention. In particular, each of the independent claims has been amended to make it clearer

that request statistics include content of the network traffic and include at least one of: size of

a request and a reply to the request, request payload, number of fragments in the request and

request content anomalies. Support for these additional limitations to claims 1 and 9 appear

on page 10, lines 20-30 of the specification.

Clearly, the prior art of record taken either alone or in combination with one

another fail to disclose these new limitations. For example, Kato, et al. does not look at the

content of network traffic at all. It only looks at TCP ACK/reset packets which are in the TCP

header and which are separate from content.

Also, the U.S. Patent to Belissent does not look at the content of the network

traffic at all. It only looks at TCP connections per time interval. Information about TCP

connections is contained entirely in the TCP header. Consequently, Belissent ignores the

content of the connections.

The remaining prior art of record fails to make up for the deficiencies of Kato,

et al. and Belissent, et al.

-5-

Atty Dkt No. UOM 0206 PUSP

S/N: 09/855,818

Reply to Office Action of April 26, 2006

Consequently, in view of the above and in the absence of better art Applicants' Attorney respectfully submits the application is in condition for allowance which allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald R. Malan, et al.

By.

David R. Syrowik Reg. No. 27,956

Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: July 13, 2006

## **BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor Southfield, MI 48075-1238

Phone: 248-358-4400 Fax: 248-358-3351